arXiv:1608.06151v1 [math.AP] 22 Aug 2016

Local and Global Existence of Strong Solutions to Large Cross Diffusion Systems.

Dung Le[1]

Abstract

We study the solvability of a general class of cross diffusion systems and establish the local and global existence of their strong solutions under the weakest assumption that they are VMO. This work simplifies the setting in our previous work [16] and provides new extensions which are more verifiable in applications.

1 Introduction

In this paper, for any $T_0 > 0$ and bounded domain Ω with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, we consider the following general parabolic system of m equations ($m \geq 2$)

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(u)Du) + \hat{f}(u, Du) & (x,t) \in Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0), \\ u(x,0) = U_0(x) & x \in \Omega \\ u = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T_0). \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $A(u)$ is a $m \times m$ matrix in u; $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $\hat{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{mn} \times \mathbb{R}^{nm} \to \mathbb{R}^m$ are vector valued functions. The initial data U_0 is given in $W^{1,p_0}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ for some $p_0 > n$, the dimension of Ω. As usual, $W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$, $p \geq 1$, will denote the standard Sobolev spaces whose elements are vector valued functions $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ with finite norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)} = \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|Du\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

We say that u is a strong solution if u is continuous on $\bar{Q}$ with $Du \in L^\infty_{loc}(Q)$ and $D^2u \in L^2_{loc}(Q)$.

The strongly coupled system (1.1) appears in many physical applications, for instance, Maxwell-Stephan systems describing the diffusive transport of multicomponent mixtures, models in reaction and diffusion in electrolysis, flows in porous media, diffusion of polymers, or population dynamics, among others. We refer the reader to the recent work [5] and the references therein for the models and the existence of their *weak* solutions.

The first fundamental problem in the study of (1.1) is the local and global existence of its solutions. One can decide to work with either weak or strong solutions. In the first case, the existence of a weak solution can be easily achieved via Galerkin or variational methods but its regularity (e.g., boundedness, Hölder continuity of the solution and its higher derivatives) is still an open issue. Several works have been done along this line to improve the early work [8] and establish *partial regularity* of *bounded* weak solutions to (1.1).

[1]Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at San Antonio, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249. Email: Dung.Le@utsa.edu

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 35J70, 35B65, 42B37.

Key words: Cross diffusion systems, Hölder regularity, global existence.

Otherwise, if strong solutions are considered then theirs existence can be established via semigroup theories as in the works of Amann [1, 2]. Combining with interpolation theories of Sobolev's spaces, Amann established local and global existence of a strong solution u of (1.1) under the assumption that one can controll $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)}$ for some $p > n$.

In both forementioned approaches, the assumption on the boundedness of u must be the starting point. For strongly coupled systems like (1.1), as invariant/maximum principles for cross diffusion systems are generally unavailable, the boundedness of the solutions is already a hard problem. One usually needs to use ad hoc techniques on the case by case basis to show that u is bounded (see [7, 18]). Even for bounded weak solutions, we know that they are only Hölder continuous almost everywhere (see [8]). In addition, there are counter examples for systems ($m > 1$) which exhibit solutions that start smoothly and remain bounded but develop singularities in higher norms in finite times (see [6]).

In our recent work [16], we choose a different approach making use of fixed point theory and discuss the solvability of (1.1) under the weakest assumption that u is VMO (see (1.7) below) and much more general structural conditions on the data of (1.1). The proof in [16] relies on fixed point theories, instead of the semigroup approach in [1], and weighted Gagliardo-Ninrehnberg inequalities involving BMO norms.

In particular, we assumed in [16] the followings.

A) $A(u)$ is C^1 in u and there are constants $\lambda_0, C_* > 0$ and a scalar C^1 function $\lambda(u)$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$

$$\lambda(u) \geq \lambda_0,\ \lambda(u)|\zeta|^2 \leq \langle A(u)\zeta, \zeta\rangle \text{ and } |A(u)| \leq C_*\lambda(u). \tag{1.2}$$

In addition, $|A_u| \leq C|\lambda_u|$ and the following number is finite:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \sup_{W\in\mathbb{R}^m} \frac{|\lambda_W(W)|}{\lambda(W)}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here and throughout this paper, if B is a C^1 function in $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ then we abbreviate it derivative $\frac{\partial B}{\partial u}$ by B_u.

F) There exist a constant C and a C^1 function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ such that for any diffrentiable vector valued functions $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and $p : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{mn}$

$$|\hat{f}(u,p)| \leq C\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)|p| + f(u), \tag{1.4}$$

$$|D\hat{f}(u,p)| \leq C\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)|Dp| + C\frac{|\lambda_u(u)|}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(u)}|Du||p| + |f_u(u)||Du|, \tag{1.5}$$

$$|f_u(u)| \leq C\lambda(u). \tag{1.6}$$

The local existence of a strong solution of (1.1) was proved in [16] under the key assumption (see the condition M') in the paper) that any strong solution u of the system satisfies: for any given $\mu_0 > 0$ there is a positive R_{μ_0} such that

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^2 \sup_{x_0\in\bar{\Omega},t\in(0,T_0)} \|u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{BMO(B_{R_{\mu_0}}(x_0)\cap\Omega)} \leq \mu_0. \tag{1.7}$$

Here, a locally integrable function $U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be in $BMO(\Omega)$ if the quantity

$$[U]_* := \sup_{B_R(y)\subset\Omega} \fint_{B_R(y)} |U - U_{B_R(y)}|\, dx \quad \text{is finite.}$$

The Banach space $BMO(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ consists of functions with finite norm

$$\|U\|_{BMO(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)} := [U]_* + \|U\|_{L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^m)}.$$

We also say that U is VMO on Ω if $\inf_{R>0, B_R\subset\Omega} \|U\|_{BMO(B_R,\mathbb{R}^m)} = 0$.

In this paper, for simplicity of the presentation and with models in applications in mind, we consider first the following special form of the reaction terms which are linear in Du, namely, $\hat{f}(u, Du) = B(u)Du + f(u)$ and study local and global existence of strong solutions. Thanks to this form of $\hat{f}$ the fixed point argument in [16] can be greatly simplified. Furthermore, we will provide conditions which are a bit stronger than M') but verifiable in applications. In particular, we will show that a strong solution u exists globally if the norm $\|u\|_{W^{1,n}(\Omega)}$ does not blow up in finite time. This relaxes Amann's conditions in [1] which required a control on $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ for some $p > n$. Again, we are not assuming that u is bounded and our structural conditions A) and F) are more general than those in [1]. We then show that our results continue to hold for general $\hat{f}(u, Du)$ with linear growth in Du.

We organize our paper as follows. In Section 2 we state our main results. In Section 3 we give another version of the local weighted Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [16, Lemma 2.4], which is one of the main ingredients of the proof in [16] and our main theorem in this paper. Technical results and auxiliary lemmas needed for tthe proof of the main results for linear reaction terms will be given in Section 4. The proof of the general case is given in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries and Main Results

We state the main results of this paper in this this section. Our first main result concerns the local existence of strong solutions to (1.1) with $\hat{f}$ being linear in Du.

$$\hat{f}(u, Du) = B(u)Du + f(u). \tag{2.1}$$

We imbed (1.1) in the following family of systems

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(\sigma u)Du) + \hat{f}(\sigma u, \sigma Du) \quad (x,t) \in Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0), \sigma \in [0,1] \\ u(x,0) = U_0(x) \quad x \in \Omega \\ u = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T_0). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

In [16] we also assumed the condition SG) which requires that the eigenvalues of the matrix $A(u)$ are not too far apart. Namely, we need that $(n-2)/n < C_*^{-1}$, where C_* is, in certain sense, the ratio of the largest and smallest eiegenvalues of $A(u)$. Being inspired by this condition, We then assume that there is $n^* > n$ be such that $(n^* - 2)/n^* = C_*^{-1}$ or

$$n^* = \frac{C_*}{2(C_* - 1)}. \tag{2.3}$$

Theorem 2.1 *Assume A), F) with (2.1). There is $\mu_0 > 0$ sufficiently small in terms of the constants in A) and F) such that if the following two conditions hold for* any strong *solution u of (2.2)*

M.1) *For some positive R_{μ_0}, which may depends on T_0,*

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^2 \sup_{x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}, t \in (0,T_0)} \|u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{BMO(B_R(x_0)\cap\Omega)} \le \mu_0; \tag{2.4}$$

M.2) *The following quantity*

$$C_{T_0} := \iint_{\Omega\times(0,T_0)} |Du|^2 \, dz \text{ is finite}; \tag{2.5}$$

L) *There are constants $L(T_0)$ and $r^* > \frac{n}{p^*-n}$, with $p^* = \min\{n^*, p_0\}$, see the definition of n^* in (2.3), such that*

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T_0)} \|\lambda(u(\cdot,t))\|_{L^{r^*}(\Omega)} \le L(T_0), \tag{2.6}$$

then (1.1) has a unique strong solution u on $\Omega \times (0, T_0)$.

As an immediate consequence of this theorem and Lemma 5.1 at the end of the paper, we have the following result on the global existence of strong solutions.

Corollary 2.2 *If the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 hold for all $T_0 > 0$ then (1.1) has a unique strong solution u which exists globally on $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$.*

The next results are more applicable and improve those of Amann in [1, 2]. Basically, we need only to controll the $W^{1,n}(\Omega)$ norm of strong solutions while [1, 2] required that their $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ norms do not blow up in finite time for some $p > n$, and thus the boundedness of the solutions is needed.

Corollary 2.3 *The conclusion of Theorem 2.1 holds if M.1) and M.2) are replaced by the following assumption.*

D) *There is a constant C_{T_0} such that for any $t \in (0, T_0)$*

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{W^{1,n}(\Omega)} \le C_{T_0}. \tag{2.7}$$

If this condition holds for all $T_0 > 0$ then u exists globally.

Finally, concerning the integrability condition of $\lambda(u)$ in L), we have the following result.

Corollary 2.4 *If we assume further that there are constants $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

$$|\lambda_u(u)| \le \mathbf{\Lambda}_1 \lambda^{1-\varepsilon_0}(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{2.8}$$

Then the conclusion of Corollary 2.3 holds if L) is replaced by the following weaker one.

L') *There are constants* $L(T_0)$ $s_0 > 0$

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T_0)} \|\lambda^{s_0}(u(\cdot,t))\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le L(T_0). \tag{2.9}$$

It is easy to see that the condition (2.8) holds if $\lambda(u)$ with polynomial growth in u.

We now turn to the general (1.1) and consider general reaction terms. We imbed (1.1) in the following family of systems

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(\sigma u)Du) + \hat{f}(\sigma u, \sigma Du) \quad (x,t) \in Q = \Omega \times (0,T_0), \sigma \in [0,1] \\ u(x,0) = U_0(x) \quad x \in \Omega \\ u = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T_0). \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Theorem 2.5 *Assume A) and F). We assume further that*

$$|\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(u,\zeta)| \le C\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(u),\ |\partial_u \hat{f}(u,0)| \le C\lambda(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^m, \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}. \tag{2.11}$$

Then the conclusions of Theorem 2.1, Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4 continue to hold under their asumptions M.1)-L), D) and L') respectively.

3 Technical results

We provide the following version of the local weighted Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [16, Lemma 2.4], which is one of the main ingredients of the proof in [16] and our main theorem in this paper. In order to state the assumption for this type of inequalities, we recall some well known notions from Harmonic Analysis. For $\gamma \in (1,\infty)$ we say that a nonnegative locally integrable function w is an A_γ weight if the quantity

$$[w]_\gamma := \sup_{B_R(y)\subset\Omega} \left(\fint_{B_R(y)} w\, dx \right) \left(\fint_{B_R(y)} w^{1-\gamma'}\, dx \right)^{\gamma-1} \quad \text{is finite.} \tag{3.1}$$

Here, $\gamma' = \gamma/(\gamma-1)$. For more details on these classes we refer the reader to [17, 20].

We also make use of Hardy spaces $\mathcal{H}^1$. For any $y \in \Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let ϕ be any function in $C_0^\infty(B_1(y))$ with $|D\phi| \le C_1$. Let $\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-n}\phi(\frac{x}{\varepsilon})$ (then $|D\phi_\varepsilon| \le C_1\varepsilon^{-1-n}$). From [20], a function g is in $\mathcal{H}^1(\Omega)$ if

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} g * \phi_\varepsilon \in L^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = \|g\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\sup_{\varepsilon>0} g * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Throughout this paper, when there is no ambiguity C, C_i will denote universal constants that can change from line to line in our argument. If necessary, $C(\cdots)$ or $C_{(\ldots)}$ are used to denote quantities which are bounded in terms of theirs parameters in $(\cdots)$. We will also write $a \sim b$ if there are two generic positive constants C_1, C_2 such that $C_1 b \le a \le C_2 b$. Furthermore, we denote by $B_R(x_0)$ a ball with center $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$. In the sequel, if the center x_0 is already specified then we simply write B_R, Ω_R for $B_R(x_0), B_R(x_0) \cap \Omega$ respectively.

We have the following version of [16, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 3.1 *Let $u, U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be vector-valued functions with $u \in C^1(\Omega)$, $U \in C^2(\Omega)$, and let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function and $\Phi(u)^{\frac{2}{p+2}}$ be an $A_{p/(p+2)+1}$ weight. Suppose that either U or $\Phi^2(u)\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu}$ vanish on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω. For any ball $B_t(x_0)$ with center $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ we set*

$$I_1(t) := \int_{\Omega_t} \Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p+2}\, dx,\ \hat{I}_1(t) := \int_{\Omega_t} \Phi^2(u)|Du|^{2p+2}\, dx, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\bar{I}_1(t) := \int_{\Omega_t} |\Phi_u(u)|^2(|DU|^{2p+2} + |Du|^{2p+2})\, dx, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$I_2(t) := \int_{\Omega_t} \Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p-2}|D^2U|^2\, dx. \tag{3.5}$$

Consider any ball B_s concentric with B_t, $0 < s < t$, and any nonnegative C^1 function ψ such that $\psi = 1$ in B_s and $\psi = 0$ outside B_t. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are positive constants $C_{\varepsilon,\Phi}$, which depends on $[\Phi]_{p/(p+2)+1}$, and C_ε such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(s) \ \leq\ & \varepsilon[I_1(t) + \hat{I}_1(t)] + C_{\varepsilon,\Phi}\|U\|^2_{BMO(\Omega_t)}\,[\bar{I}_1(t) + I_2(t)] \\ & + C_\varepsilon\|U\|^2_{BMO(\Omega_t)} \sup_{x\in B_t}|D\psi(x)|^2 \int_{\Omega_t} \Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

The only difference between the two versions is that the factor $\|U\|^2_{BMO(B_t)}$ in the last terms of (3.6) here replaces the factor $\|U\|_{BMO(B_t)}$ in the eqn. (2.17) of [16, Lemma 2.4]. The two proofs differ only by the order of using Young's inequality in the argument. For the sake of completeness we present the details.

Proof: We revisit the proof of the global weighted Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [16, Lemma 2.1]. Integrating by parts and using the assumptions on $\Phi(u), U$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \Phi^2(u)\psi^2|DU|^{2p+2}\, dx = -\int_\Omega U\mathrm{div}(\Phi^2(u)\psi^2|DU|^{2p}DU)\, dx. \tag{3.7}$$

We will show that $g = \mathrm{div}(\Phi^2\psi^2|DU|^{2p}DU)$ belongs to the Hardy space $\mathcal{H}^1$ (see (3.2)). We write $g = g_1 + g_2$ with $g_i = \mathrm{div}V_i$, setting

$$V_1 = \Phi(u)\psi|DU|^{p+1}\left(\Phi(u)\psi|DU|^{p-1}DU - \fint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \Phi(u)\psi|DU|^{p-1}DU\, dx\right),$$

(here, $\Omega_\varepsilon = B_\varepsilon(y) \cap \Omega$, with y being the variable of V_i) and

$$V_2 = \Phi(u)\psi|DU|^{p+1}\fint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \Phi(u)\psi|DU|^{p-1}DU\, dx.$$

In estimating V_1 we follow the proof of [16, Lemma 2.1] and replace $\Phi(u)$ by $\Phi(u)\psi(x)$. There will be some extra terms in the proof in computing $D(\Phi(u)\psi)$. In particular, in estimating Dh in the right hand side of [16, eqn. (2.8)] we have the following term and it can be estimated as follows

$$\left(\fint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \Phi^{s_*}(u)|D\psi|^{s_*}|DU|^{ps_*}\, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{s_*}} \leq \sup_{x\in B_t}|D\psi|\left(\fint_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \Phi^{s_*}(u)|DU|^{ps_*}\, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{s_*}}.$$

We then use Hölder's inequality, in the right hand side of [16, eqn. (2.9)] (with $\Omega = B_t$, M is the maximal operator, and the definition of Ψ_1 there)

$$\sup|D\psi|\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \Psi_1 M(\Phi^{s_*}(u)|DU|^{ps_*})^{\frac{1}{s_*}}\,dx \leq$$
$$C\sup_{x\in B_t}|D\psi|\left(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\Psi_1^2\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Omega_t} M(\Phi^{s_*}(u)|DU|^{ps_*})^{\frac{2}{s_*}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The last integral can be bounded via the Hardy-Littlewood inequality [16, eqn. (2.4)] by

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\,dx.$$

Using the fact that $|\psi|\leq 1$ and $\Omega = B_t$, the proof of [16, Lemma 2.1] can go on and [16, eqn. (2.11)] now becomes

$$\int_{\Omega_t}\sup_\varepsilon|g_1*\phi_\varepsilon|\,dx \leq$$
$$C\left[I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar{I}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}+I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}I_2^{\frac{1}{2}}+\sup_{B_t}|D\psi|I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Omega_t}\Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \tag{3.8}$$

Similarly, in considering $g_2 = \mathrm{div}V_2$, we will have the following extra term

$$\sup_\varepsilon|\phi_\varepsilon*\Phi(u)||D\psi||DU|^{p+1}\fint_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\Phi(u)|DU|^p\,dx,$$

which can be estimated by $\sup_{B_t}|D\psi|M(\Phi(u)|DU|^{p+1})M(\Phi(u)|DU|^p)$. Using Hölder's inequality and the Hardy-Littlewood inequality, the integral over B_t of this quantity is bounded by

$$\sup_{B_t}|D\psi|I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon}\Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore the estimate [16, eqn. (2.16)] is now (3.8) with g_1 being replaced by g_2. Combining the estimates for g_1, g_2 and using Young's inequality, we get

$$\int_{\Omega_t}\sup_\varepsilon|g*\phi_\varepsilon|\,dx \leq$$
$$\sup_{B_t}|D\psi|I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Omega_t}\Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_\Phi\left[\bar{I}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}+\hat{I}_1^{\frac{1}{2}})+I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}I_2^{\frac{1}{2}}\right].$$

The above gives an estimate for the $\mathcal{H}^1$ norm of g (see (3.2)). By the Fefferman-Stein duality theorem (see [20]) and (3.7), we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_t}\Phi^2(u)\psi^2|DU|^{2p+2}\,dx \leq \|U\|_{BMO(\Omega_t)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq$$
$$\|U\|_{BMO(\Omega_t)}\left(\sup_{B_t}|D\psi|I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{\Omega_t}\Phi^2(u)|DU|^{2p}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+C_\Phi\left[\bar{I}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}(I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}+\hat{I}_1^{\frac{1}{2}})+I_1^{\frac{1}{2}}I_2^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]\right).$$

A simple use Young's inequality and then the fact that $\psi = 1$ in B_s gives (3.6) and completes the proof. ∎

We now let $\Phi \equiv 1$ and ψ be a cutoff function for B_s, B_t, i.e. $\psi = 1$ in B_s and $\psi = 0$ outside B_t and $|D\psi| \le 1/(t-s)$, then Φ is an A_γ weight for all $\gamma > 1$ and $\Phi_u \equiv 0$. The following version of the above lemma with $u = U$ suffices for our purpose in this paper.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a vector-valued function in $C^2(\Omega)$. Suppose that either U or $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu}$ vanish on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω. For any two concentric balls B_s, B_t, with $s < t$, and any $p \ge 1, \varepsilon > 0$ there is $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_s} |DU|^{2p+2}\, dx \le \varepsilon \int_{B_t} |DU|^{2p+2}\, dx + \\ C_\varepsilon \|U\|^2_{BMO(\Omega_t)} \int_{\Omega_t} [|DU|^{2p-2}|D^2U|^2 + (t-s)^{-2}|DU|^{2p}]\, dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

4 The proof of the main results

In this section, we present the proof of Theorem 2.1 and its corollaries. The proof relies on the Leray Schauder theorem. We obtain the existence of a strong solution u of (1.1) as a fixed point of a nonlinear map defined on an appropriate Banach space.

Let us consider the Banach space $\mathbf{X} = C(Q, \mathbb{R}^m)$, where $Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0)$. For any given $u \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, we consider the following linear system

$$\begin{cases} w_t = \operatorname{div}(A(\sigma u)Dw) + B(\sigma u)Dw + f(\sigma u) \quad (x,t) \in Q, \\ w(x,0) = U_0(x) \quad x \in \Omega \\ w = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T_0). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

We then define $T_\sigma(u) = w$. It is clear that a fixed point of T_σ solves (2.2). In order to apply the Leray-Schauder theorem, we need to establish the followings.

Step 1 The map $T_\sigma : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ is well defined and compact.

Step 2 There is a constant M such that $\|u\|_{\mathbf{X}} \le M$ for any fixed points of $u = T_\sigma(u)$.

The checking of Step 1 is fairly standard thanks to the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1 *The map $T_\sigma : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ is well defined and compact.*

Proof: For each $u \in \mathbf{X}$, $A(\sigma u)$ satisfies the ellipticity condition A) and the data of the linear system (4.1) are bounded and continuous. So that (4.1) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 in [11, Chapter VII], which applies to the system

$$w_t = \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{a}Dw) + \mathbf{b}Dw + \mathbf{g}, \tag{4.2}$$

under the assumption that $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ and $\|\mathbf{g}\|_{q,r,Q}$ are bounded for sufficiently large q, r such that $1/r + n/(2q) = 1$. Here, we denoted for any vector valued function F

$$\|F\|_{q,r,Q} := \left(\int_0^{T_0} \left(\int_\Omega |F(x,t)|^q\, dx \right)^{\frac{r}{q}} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Theorem 1.1 in [11, Chapter VII] shows that w exists uniquely so that $T_\sigma(u)$ is well defined. Moreover, as the initial condition $w(\cdot,0) = U_0(x)$ belongs to $W^{1,p_0}(\Omega)$ and then $C_0^\beta(\Omega)$ for $\beta_0 = 1 - n/p_0 > 0$, a combination of Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 in [11, Chapter VII] shows that w belongs to $C^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0/2}(\bar{Q}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ for some $\alpha_0 > 0$. Moreover, the norm $\|w\|_{C^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0/2}(\bar{Q})}$ depending on β_0 and $\|A(\sigma u)\|_\infty$, $\|B(\sigma u)\|_\infty$ $\|f_\sigma(u)\|_{q,r,Q}$. Thus, if u belongs to a bounded set K of $\mathbf{X}$ then $\|u\|_{\mathbf{X}} \le M$ for some M and there is a constant C such that

$$\|w\|_{C^{\alpha_0,\alpha_0/2}(\bar{Q})} \le C(M, \|U_0(\cdot,0)\|_{C^{\beta_0}(\Omega)}).$$

Hence, $T_\sigma(K)$ is compact in $\mathbf{X}$ and $T_\sigma : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ is a compact map. ∎

We now turn to Step 2, the hardest part of the proof, and provide a uniform estimate for the fixed points of T_σ. Such a fixed point u of T_σ satisfies (4.1) and belongs to $\mathbf{X}$. Therefore, u is a bounded weak solution and continuous so that [8, Theorems 2.1 and 3.2] apply and yield that Du is bounded in $\Omega \times (t_0, T_0)$ for all $t_0 > 0$. Thus, Du is locally bounded in $\Omega \times (0, T_0)$. It is then well known that D^2u exists in $L^2_{loc}(\Omega \times (0, T_0)$ and u is a strong solution in $\Omega \times (0, T_0)$.

Thus, in the rest of this section, we consider a strong solution u of (4.1). As the data of (4.1) satisfy the structural conditions A), F) with the same set of constants and the asumptions M.1)-L) are assumed to be uniform for all $\sigma \in [0, 1]$, we will only present the proof for $\sigma = 1$ in the sequel.

We should also emphasize that the estimates in the rest of this section do not require the special form of $\hat{f}$ in (2.1) but the growth condition in F).

For any two concentric balls B_s, B_t with $s < t$, we say that ψ is a cutoff function for B_s, B_t if ψ is a C^1 function satisfying $\psi \equiv 1$ in B_s and $\psi \equiv 0$ outside B_t and $|D\psi| \le 1/(t-s)$. Similarly, for $T_1 < T_2 < T_3$ we say that η is a cutoff function for $(T_1, T_3), (T_2, T_3)$ if η is a C^1 function satisfying $\eta(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \le T_1$ and $\eta(t) \equiv 1$ if $t \ge T_3$ and $|\eta_t| \le 1/(T_2 - T_1)$.

We begin with the following energy estimate for Du.

Lemma 4.2 *We assume that $A, \hat{f}$ satisfy A), F). Suppose that u is strong solution of (1.1) on $\Omega \times (0, T_0)$. Consider any given triple t_0, T, T' satisfying $0 < t_0 < T < T' \le T_0$ and $p \in [1, n_*/2)$, see the definition (2.3) of n_*.*

There is a constant C, which depends only on the parameters in A) and F), such that for any two concentric balls B_s, B_t with center $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $s < t$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t\in(T,T')} \int_{\Omega_s} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\, dx + \iint_{Q_{s,t_0}} |Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2\eta\, dz \le \\ C\mathbf{\Lambda}^2 \iint_{Q_{t,t_0}} |Du|^{2p+2}\eta\, dz + C((t-s)^{-2} + t_0^{-1}) \iint_{Q_{t,t_0}} |Du|^{2p}\, dz. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Here, $Q_{t,t_0} = \Omega_t \times (T - t_0, T')$ and η is a cutoff function for $(T - t_0, T'), (T, T')$.

Proof: The estimate (4.3) results from the energy estimate for Du in [16, Lemma 3.2] with $W = U = u$ and $\beta(u) = \lambda^{-1}(u)$. We differentiated the system in x to obtain

$$(Du)_t = \operatorname{div}(A(u)D^2v + A_u(u)DuDu) + D\hat{f}(u, Du). \tag{4.4}$$

We can test the above with $\lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2(x)\eta(t)$ where ψ is a cutoff function for B_s, B_t. Because $2p < n^*$ and the definition (2.3) of n_*, it is clear that $(2p-2)/(2p) < C_*^{-1}$ so that the spectral gap condition SG) in [16] and [16, Lemma 3.2] apply here. The only difference is that we keep the function η in the integrals of $|Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2$ and $|Du|^{2p+2}$ here and obtain

$$\sup_{t\in(T,T')}\int_{\Omega_s}\lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\,dx+\iint_{Q_{s,t_0}}|Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2\eta\,dz\le$$
$$C\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\iint_{Q_{t,t_0}}|Du|^{2p+2}\eta\,dz+C((t-s)^{-2}+t_0^{-1})\iint_{Q_{t,t_0}}(1+\lambda^{-1}(u))|Du|^{2p}\,dz.$$

Since $\lambda(u)$ is bounded from below, the above implies (4.3). ∎

Next, we have the following technical result.

Lemma 4.3 *Assume as in Lemma 4.2 and that the quantity*

$$C_{t_0,T,T'}:=\iint_{\Omega\times(T-t_0,T')}|Du|^2\,dz \text{ is finite.} \tag{4.5}$$

There is $\mu_0>0$ sufficiently small, in terms of the constants in A) and F), such that if for some positive R_{μ_0}, which may depends on t_0,T,T', such that

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\sup_{x_0\in\bar\Omega,t\in(T-t_0,T')}\|u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{BMO(\Omega_R(x_0)}\le\mu_0, \tag{4.6}$$

then there are $p>n/2$, an integer k_0 and a constant C^* depending only on the parameters of A) and F), $C_{t_0,T,T'}$, R_{μ_0}, and t_0,T,T' such that

$$\sup_{t\in(T,T')}\int_{\Omega_R}\lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\,dx\le C^* \text{ for any } R<2^{-k_0}R_{\mu_0}. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof: We follow the argument in the proof of [16, Proposition 3.1] with $W=U=u$. Suppose that the energy estimate (4.3) in Lemma 4.2 holds for some $p\ge 1$. We write it as

$$\mathcal{A}(s)+\mathcal{H}(s)\le C\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\mathcal{B}(t)+C[(t-s)^2+t_0^{-1}]\mathcal{C}(t),\ 0<s<t, \tag{4.8}$$

where the functions $\mathcal{A},\mathcal{H},\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(s):=\sup_{t\in(T,T')}\int_{\Omega_s}\lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\,dx,\ \mathcal{H}(s):=\iint_{Q_{s,t_0}}|Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2\eta\,dz,$$

$$\mathcal{B}(s):=\iint_{Q_{s,t_0}}|Du|^{2p+2}\eta\,dz,\ \mathcal{C}(s):=\iint_{Q_{s,t_0}}|Du|^{2p}\,dz.$$

On the other hand, we apply Lemma 3.2 to estimate $\mathcal{B}(t)$, the integral of $|Du|^{2p+2}$, on the right hand side of (4.8). Namely, we let $U=u$ and multiply (3.9) by $\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\eta$ and integrate the result over $(T-t_0,T')$ to get (recalling the definition of μ_0 in (4.6))

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\mathcal{B}(s)\le\varepsilon\mathbf{\Lambda}^2\mathcal{B}(t)+C(\varepsilon)\mu_0\mathcal{H}(t)+C(\varepsilon)\mu_0(t-s)^{-2}\mathcal{C}(t)\quad 0<s<t\le R_{\mu_0}. \tag{4.9}$$

Let us denote $F(t) := \mathcal{B}(t)$, $G(t) := \mathcal{H}(t) + \mathbf{\Lambda}^2\mathcal{B}(t)$, $g(t) := \mathcal{C}(t)$ and $h(t) := t_0^{-1}\mathcal{C}(t)$. The above yields

$$F(s) \le \varepsilon_0[F(t) + G(t)] + C(t-s)^{-2}g(t) + Ch(t), \tag{4.10}$$

where $\varepsilon_0 = \mathbf{\Lambda}^2\varepsilon + C(\varepsilon)\mu_0$. Adding (4.8) and (4.9), we also have

$$G(s) \le C[F(t) + (t-s)^{-2}g(t) + h(t)]. \tag{4.11}$$

It is clear that ε_0 can be small if ε and then μ_0 are sufficiently small. Thus, if μ_0 is sufficiently small in terms of the constant C of (4.11), which depends on the constants in A),F), then we can apply a simple iteration argument [16, Lemma 3.11] to obtain for $0 < s < t \le R_{\mu_0}$

$$F(s) + G(s) \le C[(t-s)^{-2}g(t) + h(t)].$$

Thus, for any $R < R_{\mu_0}/2$ we take $t = 2R$ and $s = t/2$ and obtain

$$\iint_{Q_{R,t_0}} (|Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2 + |Du|^{2p+2})\, dz \le C_1(R^{-2} + t_0^{-1}) \iint_{Q_{2R,t_0}} |Du|^{2p}\, dz. \tag{4.12}$$

The above argument shows that if there are $p \ge 1$ and a constant $C(R, t_0)$ such that the energy estimate (4.3) holds for p and

$$\iint_{Q_{2R,t_0}} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\, dz \le C(R, t_0), \tag{4.13}$$

then this estimate also holds for p being replaced by any $q \in (p, p+1]$, via (4.12) and Hölder's inequality. Since (4.13) holds for $p = 1$, see (4.5), it is now clear that we can repeat the argument k_0 times to find a number $p > n/2$, as long as $2p < n^*$ (so that (4.3) holds by Lemma 4.2). We then see that (4.12) and (4.13) hold for such p and the estimate (4.7) follows from the energy estimate for (4.3), with $t = 2R, s = R$. The lemma is proved. ∎

The above lemma made use of a cutoff function η for the interval $[T - t_0, T]$ and $[T, T']$ to avoid the dependence on the initial data at $t = 0$. This type of result is useful when one wants to discuss the long time dynamics and global attractors of the system.

In order to establish the local and global existence results, we have to provide bounds for u in $\Omega \times [0, T_0)$ and allow $t_0 = 0$. The next lemma considers this case.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume as in Lemma 4.3 with $T = t_0 = 0$. In addition, we assume that*

$$u \in C([0, T'), L^{2p}(\Omega)), \tag{4.14}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T')} \|Du(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} < \infty. \tag{4.15}$$

Then, for the same constant C^* the conclusion (4.7) now reads

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T')} \int_{\Omega_R} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\, dx \le C^* + C\|Du(\cdot, 0)\|^{2p}_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \text{ for any } R < 2^{-k_0}R_{\mu_0}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof: Thanks to the assumption (4.15), we can let $t_0 \to 0$ in (4.12) to see that it also holds for $t_0 = 0$ and we can also let $T = 0$. That is if $\|Du\|_{L^{2p}(Q_{2R,0})}$ is finite then for $Q_{R,0} = \Omega_R \times (0, T')$

$$\iint_{Q_{R,0}} (|Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2 + |Du|^{2p+2})\ dz < \infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Using the difference quotience operator δ_h instead of D in (4.4) in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we obtain

$$(\delta_h u)_t = \mathrm{div}(A(u)D(\delta_h u) + \delta_h(A(u))Du) + \delta_h \hat{f}(u, Du). \tag{4.18}$$

We test this with $\lambda^{-1}(u)|\delta_h u|^{2p-2}\delta_h u\psi^2(x)$ where ψ is a cutoff function for B_s, B_t. Since $u \in C([0, T'), L^{2p}(\Omega))$, the energy estimate in Lemma 4.2 holds for $t_0 = 0$ and the operator D is replaced by δ_h. We have

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T')} \int_{\Omega_s} \lambda^{-1}(u)|\delta_h u|^{2p}\ dx + \iint_{Q_{s,0}} |\delta_h u|^{2p-2}|D\delta_h u|^2\ dz \le$$
$$C\mathbf{\Lambda}^2 \iint_{Q_{t,0}} |Du|^2|\delta_h u|^{2p}\ dz + (t-s)^{-2}\iint_{Q_{t,0}} |\delta_h u|^{2p}]\ dz + C\int_{\Omega_t} |\delta_h u(x,0)|^{2p}\ dx.$$

As we now see that the integral in (4.17) is finite so that we can let h tend to 0 and obtain a similar energy estimate (4.3) for Du with $t_0 = 0$ and $\eta \equiv 1$. Namely,

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T')} \int_{\Omega_s} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\ dx + \iint_{Q_{s,0}} |Du|^{2p-2}|D^2u|^2\ dz \le$$
$$C\mathbf{\Lambda}^2 \iint_{Q_{t,0}} |Du|^{2p+2}\ dz + (t-s)^{-2}\iint_{Q_{t,0}} |Du|^{2p}]\ dz + C\int_{\Omega_t} |Du(x,0)|^{2p}\ dx. \tag{4.19}$$

Again, we can argue as in Lemma 4.3 to treat $\mathcal{B}(t)$, the integral of $|Du|^{2p+2}$, on the right hand side and redefine $h(t) := \|Du(\cdot, 0)\|^{2p}_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}$. The same argument then yields a version of (4.12) with $t_0 = 0$. We obtain in particular

$$\iint_{Q_{R,0}} |Du|^{2p+2}\ dz \le C_1 R^{-2}\iint_{Q_{2R,0}} |Du|^{2p}\ dz + C_1\|Du(\cdot, 0)\|^{2p}_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.20}$$

The iteration argument after (4.12) in the proof of Lemma 4.3 on the power p then gives (4.16). This completes the proof. ∎

Remark 4.5 If the energy estimate (4.3) holds with the last term is replaced by the integral of $|Du|^{2p} + \mathcal{F}$ for some $\mathcal{F} \in L^1_{loc}(Q)$ then the argument in Lemma 4.3 yields (4.12) with the integral of $|Du|^{2p}$ on right hand side being replaced by that of $|Du|^{2p} + \mathcal{F}$ over Q_{2R,t_0}. Similar observation applies to Lemma 4.4.

We are now ready to provide the proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2.1: By Lemma 4.1, the map $T_\sigma : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ defined by (4.1) is compact. In order to apply the Leray-Schauder theorem and show that there is a fixed point u for $\sigma = 1$, which the solution of (1.1), we need only to provide a uniform bound

for the fixed points of T_σ. To this end, for any $\sigma \in [0,1]$ we consider a fixed point u of $T_\sigma(u) = u$.

Since $u \in \mathbf{X}$, u is a bounded weak solution and continuous so that [8, Theorems 2.1 and 3.1] apply and yield that Du is locally bounded in $Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0)$. It is then well known that D^2u exists and $D^2u \in L_{loc}(Q)$ and thus u is a strong solution in Q.

We will apply Lemma 4.4 here. First of all, the continuity assumption (4.14) of the lemma is clear because $u \in \mathbf{X}$. Next, for any $q = 2p \in (n, p_0)$ we show that $\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)}$ is bounded $[0, T_0)$ to verify (4.15). For any $h > 0$ and any function w we denote by $w_{(h)} = \phi_h * w$ the mollifier/regularizer of w. We have for any $f \in L^{q'}(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega D(u(x,t)_{(h)})f(x)\,dx &= \int_\Omega (Du(x,t))_{(h)}f(x)\,dx = \int_\Omega Du(x,t)f_{(h)}(x)\,dx \\ &= \int_\Omega u(x,t)Df_{(h)}(x)\,dx \to \int_\Omega u(x,0)Df_{(h)}(x)\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

as $t \to 0$ because $u \in \mathbf{X}$. The last term in the above is bounded by $\|u(\cdot,0)\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}\|f_h\|_{L^{q'}(\Omega)}$ or $C\|U_0\|_{W^{1,p_0}(\Omega)}\|f\|_{L^{q'}(\Omega)}$. By the Uniform Boundedness Principle, noting that $Du(\cdot,t) \in L^q(\Omega)$ for each $t > 0$, we see that $\|Du_{(h)}(\cdot,t)\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$ is uniformly bounded for all $h > 0$ and $t \in [0, T_0)$. Let $h \to 0$ we derive that $\|Du(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}$ is bounded for $t \in [0, T_0)$. Thus, for each fixed point u of T_σ the condition (4.15) holds.

Hence, from the assumptions M.1) and M.2), Lemma 4.4 can apply here to provide uniform constants C^*, R_1 depending only on the parameters of A) and F), C_{T_0}, R_{μ_0}, and $\|DU_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega)}$ such that if $p < p^* = \frac{1}{2}\min\{n^*, p_0\}$ then

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T_0)} \int_{\Omega_{R_1}} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\,dx \le C^*. \tag{4.21}$$

From the definition of r^* it is clear that we can choose p, p_1 such that $n < p_1 < p < p^*$ and $r^* = p_1/(p - p_1)$. As $r^* = p_1/p(p/p_1)'$, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$\int_{\Omega_{R_1}} |Du|^{2p_1}\,dx \le \|\lambda(u)\|_{L^{r^*}(\Omega_{R_1})} \left(\int_{\Omega_{R_1}} \lambda^{-1}(u)|Du|^{2p}\,dx\right)^{p_1/p}. \tag{4.22}$$

From the assumption L) on $\lambda(u)$ and (4.21), the right hand side of (4.22) will be bounded uniformly for all $\sigma \in [0,1]$.

We then have a uniform bounded for $\|u\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)}$. As $q = 2p_1 > n$, by Sobolev's embedding theorem, we see that $\|u\|_{\mathbf{X}} \le M$ for some constant M and all $\sigma \in [0,1]$. The Leray Schauder theory then applies to provide a fixed point $u = T_1(u)$. By Lemma 5.1 at the end of this paper, which deals with uniqueness of continuous weak solutions, this fixed point is the unique strong solution of the system (1.1). The proof is then complete. ∎

Proof of Corollary 2.2: For any positives T_1, T_2 with $T_1 < T_2$, since we are assuming that the conditions of Theorem 2.1 hold for all $T_0 > 0$, we see that (1.1) has strong solutions u_i's on $Q_i = \Omega \times (0, T_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. We also showed that there is a constant C_i such that $\sup_{[0,T_i)} \|u_i\|_{W^{1,2p}(\Omega)} \le C_i$ for some $p > n/2$. By Lemma 5.1 on the uniqueness of the weak solutions satisfying this boundedness, we see that $u_1 \equiv u_2$ on Q_1. Thus, (1.1) has a unique strong solution which exists globally. ∎

Proof of Corollary 2.3: We just need to show that the assumption D) implies M.1) and M.2). It is clear that D) yields M.2). To verify M.1) we argue by contradiction. If this is not the case then there are sequences $\{x_n\} \subset \bar{\Omega}$, $\{\sigma_n\} \subset [0,1]$, $\{t_n\} \subset (0,T_0)$, $\{r_n\}$, $r_n \to 0$ and a sequence of strong solutions $\{u_{\sigma_n}\}$ such that for $U_n(\cdot) = u_{\sigma_n}(\cdot, t_n)$

$$\|U_n\|_{BMO(B_{r_n}(x_n)\cap\Omega)} > \varepsilon_0 \text{ for some } \varepsilon_0 > 0.$$

By D) we see that the sequence $\{U_n\}$ is bounded in $W^{1,n}(\Omega)$. We can then assume that U_n converges weakly to some U in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$. We then have $\|U_n\|_{BMO(B_R\cap\Omega)} \to \|U\|_{BMO(B_R\cap\Omega)}$ for any given ball B_R. It is easy to see that $U \in W^{1,n}(\Omega)$ and by Poincaré's inequality U is VMO and $\|U\|_{BMO(B_R\cap\Omega)} < \varepsilon_0/2$ if R is sufficiently small. The number R is independent of $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ because $\|U\|_{W^{1,n}(\Omega)}$ is independent of λ_0. Furthermore, we can assume also that x_n converges to some $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. Thus, for large n, we have $r_n < R/2$ and $x_n \in B_{R/2}(x)$. Then, for large n, $B_{r_n}(x_n) \subset B_R(x)$ and

$$\|U_n\|_{BMO(B_{r_n}(x_n)\cap\Omega)} \leq \|U_n\|_{BMO(B_R(x)\cap\Omega)} \leq \|U\|_{BMO(B_R(x)\cap\Omega)} + \varepsilon_0/2 < \varepsilon_0.$$

We obtain a contradiction. Thus, M.1) holds and the proof is complete. ∎

Proof of Corollary 2.4: We need only show that D) and L') together imply L). Let u be any strong solution of (2.2) and $\lambda(u)$ satisfy (2.8). There are positives s_0, C_0 and such that

$$\|\lambda^{s_0}(u)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_0(T_0). \tag{4.23}$$

We will show that for any $r > 1$ there is a constant C depending on $C_0, s_0, r, |\Omega|, T_0$ and $\|u\|_{W^{1,n}(\Omega)}$ such that

$$\|\lambda(u)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \leq C. \tag{4.24}$$

We choose and fix $s > 0$ and $p \in (1,n)$ such that $sp_* = s_0$, where $p_* = np/(n-p)$. Then (4.23) implies

$$\|\lambda^s(u)\|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)} \leq C_0^{\frac{1}{p_*}}(T_0). \tag{4.25}$$

Define $g(\cdot) = \lambda^{s+\varepsilon_0}(u(\cdot,t))$. The definition of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1$ in (2.8) gives

$$|Dg| \leq C(s)\frac{|\lambda_u|}{\lambda^{1-\varepsilon_0}(u)}\lambda^s(u)|Du| \leq C(s)\mathbf{\Lambda}_1\lambda^s(u)|Du|.$$

Hence, by Hölder's inequality, $\|Dg\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C\|\lambda^s(u)\|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}\|Du\|_{L^n(\Omega)}$. This and (4.25) and D) imply some $C(T_0)$ such that $\|Dg\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(T_0)$. Using Hölder's inequality, we have $\|g\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|\lambda^s(u)\|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}^{(s+\varepsilon_0)/s} \leq CC_0^{1+\varepsilon_0/(p_*s)}(T_0)$. Hence,

$$\|g\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C(T_0) + CC_0^{1+\varepsilon_0/(p_*s)}(T_0).$$

By Sobolev's embedding theorem, $\|g\|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)}$ is bounded. From the definition of g, we can find a constant $\bar{C}(T_0)$ such that $\|\lambda^{s+\varepsilon_0}(u)\|_{L^{p_*}(\Omega)} \leq \bar{C}(T_0)$. Thus, there is a constant $C_1(T_0)$ such that

$$\|\lambda^{s_0+p_*\varepsilon_0}(u)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_1(T_0).$$

This shows that if (4.23) holds for some s_0 then it also holds for s_0 being $s_0 + p_*\varepsilon_0$ and new constant $C_1(T_0)$. It is then clear that we can repeat this argument to see that

$\|\lambda^{s_0+kp_*\varepsilon_0}(u)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le C_k(T_0)$ for all integers k and some $C_k(T_0)$. This fact and a simple use of Hölder's inequality show that L) holds. The proof is complete. ∎

Remark 4.6 By (4.22), u is Hölder in x. We can show that u is also Hölder continuous in x, t. Indeed, (4.12) with $p = 1$ shows that $|D^2u|^2, |Du|^4$ are in $L^1(Q)$. We obtain from the system of u and a simple use of Hölder's inequality that

$$\|u_t\|_{L^1(Q)} \le \|A(u)\|_{L^2(Q)}\|D^2u\|_{L^2(Q)} + \|A_u(u)\|_{L^2(Q)}\||Du|^2\|_{L^2(Q)} + \|\hat{f}\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Since $|A(u)|, |A_u(u)| \le \lambda(u)$ and $\hat{f}$ has linear growth in Du, the right hand side is finite and bounded by a constant independent of λ_0 (using (4.12) with $p = 1$ and then (4.22) to see that $\|D^2u\|_{L^2(Q)} \le C\lambda_0^{-1}$). Thus, u_t belongs to $L^1(Q)$. It is is well known that if u is Hölder continuous in x and u_t is in $L^1(Q)$ then u is Hölder in x, t (see [**?**, Lemma 4]).

5 The general reaction term and the proof of Theorem 2.5

We provide the proof of Theorem 2.5 in this section. Recall the assumption (2.11) of Theorem 2.5

$$|\partial_\zeta \hat{f}(u,\zeta)| \le C\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(u),\ |\partial_u \hat{f}(u,0)| \le C\lambda(u). \tag{5.1}$$

We then define $F_\sigma(u,\zeta) := \hat{f}(\sigma u, \sigma\zeta)$ and

$$B_\sigma(u,\zeta) := \int_0^1 \partial_\zeta F_\sigma(u, t\zeta)\, dt, \quad f_\sigma(u) := \int_0^1 \partial_u F_\sigma(tu, 0)\, dt. \tag{5.2}$$

Fixing $h > 0$, for any given $u \in \mathbf{X}$ and $\sigma \in [0,1]$ we consider the following linear system

$$\begin{cases} w_t = \operatorname{div}(A(\sigma u)Dw) + B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)Dw + f_\sigma(u)w + F_\sigma(0,0) \quad (x,t) \in Q, \\ w(x,0) = U_0(x) \quad x \in \Omega \\ w = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T_0), \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

where $B_\sigma^{(h)}(u) := B_\sigma(u, D(u_{(h)}))$ with $u_{(h)}$ being the mollifier/regularizer of u.

By (5.1), $B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)$ is bounded if $u \in \mathbf{X}$. Therefore, we can follow Lemma 4.1 and use (5.3) to define the compact map $T_\sigma : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ by $T_\alpha(u) = w$, the weak solution of (5.3).

We now consider a fixed point u of T_σ and provide a uniform estimate for $\|u\|_{\mathbf{X}}$. Note that the results in [8] still applies to the system so that u is a strong solution. We will apply Lemma 4.4 again. The first task is to establish the energy estimate (4.3) in Lemma 4.2 for Du with the new $\hat{f}(u, Du)$ is now

$$F(u, Du) = B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)Du + f_\sigma(u)u + F_\sigma(0,0).$$

Again, we differentiate the system with respect to x and test the result with $Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2\eta$. We go back to the proof of [16, Lemma 3.2] and [16, Remark 3.4] to see that we have to deal with the integral of $D(B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)Du)|Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2\eta$. Integrating by parts, we have

$$\iint_Q D(B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)Du)|Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2\eta\ dz = -\iint_Q B_\sigma^{(h)}(u)DuD(|Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2)\eta\ dz.$$

Expanding $D(|Du|^{2p-2}Du\psi^2)$ and using (5.1) we can see easily that the energy estimate for Du still holds. Therefore, Lemma 4.4 applies to give a uniform estimate for $\|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ for some $p > n$. The same fixed point argument now gives a fixed point $U^{(h)}$ of T_1, solving

$$(U^{(h)})_t = \operatorname{div}(A(U^{(h)})DU^{(h)}) + B_1(U^{(h)}, DU^{(h)}_{(h)})DU^{(h)} + f_1(U^{(h)})U^{(h)} + F_1(0,0). \quad (5.4)$$

Thus, for each $h > 0$ we obtain a strong solution $U^{(h)}$. These solutions are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty([0,T_0), W^{1,p}(\Omega))$, with $p > n$, so that there exists a sequence $h_n \to 0$ and $U_n = U^{(h_n)}$ converges in $\mathbf{X}$ to some u.

Moreover, for any $t_0 > 0$ and any compact set $K \subset \Omega \times (t_0, T_0)$ we can use the results in [8] to see that $\{DU_n\}$ is uniformly bounded in $C^{\alpha,\alpha/2}(K)$. Moreover, D^2U_n is bounded uniformly in $L^2(K)$, see (4.12) with $p = 1$. Thus, there is a subsequence $\{U_{n_k}\}$ such that DU_{n_k} converges to Du in $C(K)$. Letting $h_n \to 0$ in (5.4), we see that u is a continuous weak solution to the following system in $\Omega \times (t_0, T_0)$

$$u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(u)Du) + B_1(u, Du)Du + f_1(u)u + F_1(0,0).$$

On the other hand, from the definition (5.2), $F_\sigma(u,\zeta) = B_\sigma(u,\zeta)\zeta + f_\sigma(u)u + F_\sigma(0,0)$ and because $\hat{f}(u, Du) = F_1(u, Du)$, we see that u solves

$$u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(u)Du) + \hat{f}(u, Du). \quad (5.5)$$

Since u, Du are bounded and continuous, u is a desired strong solution in $\Omega \times (0, T_0)$. To complete the proof of the theorem, we need only show that u is unique. Note that the uniform assumptions in the theorem implies that any strong solution u is also a weak solution satisfying for some constants C^* and $p > n/2$

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T_0)} \int_\Omega |Du|^{2p}\, dx \le C^*. \quad (5.6)$$

The uniqueness of u then follows from Lemma 5.1 below.

We consider the following general quasilinear system.

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \operatorname{div}(A(u, Du)) + F(u, Du) \quad (x,t) \in Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0), \\ u(x,0) = U_0(x) \quad x \in \Omega \\ u = 0 \text{ or } \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \times (0, T_0). \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

Here, A, F are maps from $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ into $\mathbb{R}^m$. We assume the following conditions.

A.1) (Monotonicity condition) There is $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$

$$\lambda_0|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^2 \le \langle A(u,\zeta_1) - A(u,\zeta_2), \zeta_1 - \zeta_2\rangle. \quad (5.8)$$

A.2) (Lipschitz condition) There is a continuous function C on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that for any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$

$$|A(u_1,\zeta_1) - A(u_2,\zeta_1)| \le C(u_1,u_2)|u_1 - u_2||\zeta_1|. \quad (5.9)$$

$$|F(u_1,\zeta_1) - F(u_2,\zeta_2)| \le C(u_1,u_2)(|u_1 - u_2||\zeta_2| + |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|). \quad (5.10)$$

It is easy to see that (5.8) and (5.9) are satisfied if the matrix A_ζ is positive definite and A is Lipschitz in u and has a linear growth in ζ. Concerning (5.10), we note that

$$|F(u_1,\zeta_1) - F(u_2,\zeta_2)| \le |F(u_1,\zeta_2) - F(u_2,\zeta_2)| + |F(u_1,\zeta_1) - F(u_1,\zeta_2)|$$

so that (5.10) can be verified if $F(u, Du)$ is Lipschitz in u and Du.

Lemma 5.1 *Assume A.1) and A.2). Suppose that there are constants C^* and $p > n/2$ such that* any *weak solution u of (5.7) on $Q = \Omega \times (0, T_0)$ satisfies*

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T_0)} \int_\Omega |Du|^{2p}\, dx \le C^*. \tag{5.11}$$

Then (5.7) has at most one weak solution on Q.

Proof: Let u_1, u_2 be two weak solutions to (5.7) and $w = u_1 - u_2$. Substracting the two systems and rearranging, we have

$$w_t = \operatorname{div}(I_1 + I_2) + I_3,$$

where $I_1 := A(u_1, Du_1) - A(u_1, Du_2)$,

$$I_2 := A(u_1, Du_2) - A(u_2, Du_2) \text{ and } I_3 := F(u_1, Du_1) - F(u_2, Du_2).$$

Multiplying the system for w with w, integrating over $Q_t = \Omega \times (0, t)$ and integrating by parts in x, since $w = 0$ at $t = 0$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |w(\cdot,t)|^2\, dx + \iint_{Q_t} \langle I_1, Dw\rangle\, dz = \iint_{Q_t} [-\langle I_2, Dw\rangle + \langle I_3, w\rangle]\, dz,$$

In the sequel, we will use the assumptions A.1) and A.2) with $\zeta_1 = Du_1$, $\zeta_2 = Du_2$. In particular, using A.1) in $\langle I_1, Dw\rangle$, we get

$$\int_\Omega |w(\cdot,t)|^2\, dx + \lambda_0 \iint_{Q_t} |Dw|^2\, dz \le \int_0^t [J_2(s) + J_3(s)]\, ds, \tag{5.12}$$

where

$$J_2(s) := \int_\Omega |A(u_1, Du_2) - A(u_2, Du_2)||Dw|\, dx, \tag{5.13}$$

$$J_3(s) := \int_\Omega |F(u_1, Du_1) - F(u_2, Du_2)||w|\, dx. \tag{5.14}$$

The assumption (5.11) implies a constant $C(C^*)$ such that

$$\sup_{s\in(0,T_0)} \|u_i(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \sup_{s\in(0,T_0)} \|Du_i(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \le C(C^*) \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.15}$$

Concerning J_2, we use (5.9) and the boundedness of u_1, u_2 in the above and Hölder's inequality to get for $s \in (0, T_0)$

$$J_2(s) \le C(C^*) \| |w||Du_2| \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

By Hölder's inequality and (5.15) again, we have

$$C\||w||Du_2|\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|w\|_{L^{2p'}(\Omega)}\||Du_2|\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \le C(C^*)\|w\|_{L^{2p'}(\Omega)}, \tag{5.16}$$

where $2p' = 2p/(p-1)$. Because $p > n/2$, $2p' < 2n/(n-2)$ so that we can use the Poincaré-Sobolev inequality to have for any given $\varepsilon > 0$

$$C(C^*)\|w\|_{L^{2p'}(\Omega)} \le \varepsilon\|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\varepsilon, C^*)\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{5.17}$$

We now see that $J_2(s) \le C(C^*)\|w\|_{L^{2p'}(\Omega)}\|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Using (5.17) and Young's inequality, we have

$$J_2(s) \le \varepsilon\|Dw\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\varepsilon, C^*)\|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, T_0). \tag{5.18}$$

Similarly, from (5.10) $J_3(s) \le C(C^*)[\||w||Du_2|\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)}]\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and we can use (5.16), (5.17) and then Young's inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} J_3(s) &\le C(C^*)[\|w\|_{L^{2p'}(\Omega)} + \|Dw\|_{L^2(\Omega)}]\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\le \varepsilon\|Dw\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\varepsilon, C^*)\|w\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Therefore, using (5.18) and (5.19) in (5.12), we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |w(\cdot,t)|^2\, dx + \lambda_0 \iint_{Q_t} |Dw|^2\, dz \le \int_0^t (\varepsilon\|Dw(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + C(\varepsilon, C^*)\|w(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)})\, ds.$$

Choosing ε small, we the obtain the following integral Gronwall inequality.

$$\|w(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C(C^*)\int_0^t \|w(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\, ds.$$

Since $\|w(\cdot,0)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$, we obtain $w \equiv 0$, i.e., $u_1 \equiv u_2$, on Q. The proof is complete. ∎

References

[1] H. Amann. Dynamic theory of quasilinear parabolic equations II. Reactiondiffusion systems, *Differential Integral Equations,* Vol. 3, no. 1 (1990), pp. 13-75.

[2] H. Amann. Dynamic theory of quasilinear parabolic systems III. Global existence, *Math Z.* 202 (1989), pp. 219-250.

[3] S. Ahmad and D. Le. Global and Blow Up Solutions to Cross Diffusion Systems. Nonlinear Analysis Series A: TMA. In press.

[4] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations,* New York, 1969.

[5] A. Juengel, The boundedness-by-entropy method for cross-diffusion systems, *Nonlinearity*, to appear.

[6] O. John and J. Stara. On the regularity of weak solutions to parabolic systems in two spatial dimensions. *Comm. P.D.E.*, 27(1998), pp. 11591170.

[7] K. H. W. Küfner, Invariant regions for quasilinear reaction-diffusion systems and applications to a two population model, *NoDEA*, 3(1996), 421–444.

[8] M. Giaquinta and M. Struwe. On the partial regularity of weak solutions of nonlinear parabolic systems. *Math. Z.*, 179(1982), 437–451.

[9] E. Giusti. *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*. World Scientific, 2003.

[10] J. Hale. Large diffusitivity and asymptotic behavior in parabolic systems. JMAA. 118 (1986), pp. 455–466.

[11] O. A Ladyzhenskaya, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Uraltseva], *Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type,* Translations of Mathematical Monographs, AMS, 1968.

[12] D. Le. Global Existence and Regularity Results for Strongly Coupled Nonregular Parabolic Systems via Iterative Methods. *to appear on DCDS*.

[13] D. Le. Global existence results for near triangular nonlinear parabolic systems. *Adv. Nonlinear Studies*. 13 (2013), no. 4, 933-944.

[14] D. Le. Regularity of BMO weak solutions to nonlinear parabolic systems via homotopy. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 365 (2013), no. 5, 2723–2753.

[15] D. Le. Global Existence for Large Cross Diffusion Systems on Planar Domains. *submitted*.

[16] D. Le. Weighted Gagliardo-Nirenberg Inequalities Involving BMO Norms and Solvability of Strongly Coupled Parabolic Systems. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* Vol. 16, No. 1(2016), 125–146.

[17] J. Orobitg and C. Pérez. A_p weights for nondoubling measures in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and applications. newblock *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 354 (2002), 2013-2033.

[18] R. Redlinger. Existence of the global attractor for a strongly coupled parabolic system arising in population dynamics. *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 118(1995), 219–252.

[19] N. Shigesada, K. Kawasaki and E. Teramoto. *Spatial segregation of interacting species*. J. Theor. Biol., 79(1979), 83– 99.

[20] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic Analysis, Real Variable Methods, Orthogonality and Oscillatory Integrals.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[21] R. Temam. *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*. Springer (1988).

[22] A. Yagi. Global solution to some quasilinear parabolic systems in population dynamics. *Nonlin. Anal*. 21 (1993), 603-630.